

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Examiner is thanked for the Office Action mailed June 10, 2008. The status of the application is as follows:

- Claims 1-20 are pending, claims 1, 3-6, and 11-13 have been amended, and claims 14-20 have been added;
- Claims 1-13 are objected to for informalities;
- Claim 6 is objected to for informalities;
- Claims 1, 3, 4, 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vekstein (US 5,134,639);
- Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vekstein; and
- Claims 5, 7-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vekstein in view of Tsang et al. ("Electro-optical Modulators in Particle Detectors").

The objections and rejections are discussed below.

#### **The Objection to Claims 1-13**

Claims 1-13 are objected to for being generally narrative, failing to conform with current U.S. practices. Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 11, 12, and 13 have been amended herein according to the recommendations of the Examiner to conform with current U.S. practices. As such, the objection to these claims should be withdrawn.

#### **The Objection to Claim 6**

Claim 6 is objected to for having a broad range, "a detector chip," followed by a narrow range, "especially a CMOS chip." In light of the amendment made herein, the objection to claim 6 should be withdrawn.

#### **The Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 4, 6 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)**

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vekstein. This rejection should be withdrawn because Vekstein does not teach each and every element as set forth in the subject claims and, therefore, does not anticipate claims 1, 3, 4, 6 and 12.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). MPEP §2131.

Independent **claim 1** recites a detector arrangement comprising at least one detector module having a plurality of individual detector elements, and an electrical unit *having an electro-optical transducer for processing the signals of the detector elements and for generating optical detector module output signals*. The Office asserts Figure 1 of Vekstein teaches an electro-optical transducer for processing the signals of the detector elements and for generating optical detector module output signals. In particular, the Office asserts that elements 26a-26d teach an electro-optical transducer as claimed. However, the elements 26a-26d are transmitters (See column 5, lines 46-49), and not transducers. A transducer is a device that converts one type of signal to another, and in claim 1 for processing signals of the detector elements and generating optical detector module output signals. Vekstein is silent regarding the transmitters 26a-26d behaving as transducers and converting a received signal of one type to another type of signal. Therefore, Vekstein fails to teach each and every element of claim 1, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

**Claim 3**, which depends from claim 1, recites that the electrical unit comprises an opto-electrical transducer with which detector module input signals are supplied to the detector elements. The Office asserts elements 37a-37b of Figure 1 in Vekstein as teaching the opto-electrical transducer as recited in claim 3. However, the elements 37a-37 provide *control signals to the rotor*. (See column 6, lines 22-34). The elements 37a-37b do not supply detector module input signals to the detector elements 18 as purported by the Office. Thus, Vekstein fails to teach all the elements of claim 3, and the rejection of claim 3 should be withdrawn.

**Claims 4, 6, and 12** depend from claim 1 respectively and are allowable at least by virtue of their dependencies. Hence, the rejection of claims 4, 6, and 12 should be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/596,025  
Amdt. Dated: September 3, 2008  
Reply to Office Action Dated: June 10, 2008

**The Rejection of Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vekstein. **Claim 2** depends from claim 1 and is allowable at least by virtue of this dependency. Therefore, the rejection of claim 2 should be withdrawn.

**The Rejection of Claims 5, 7-11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

Claims 5, 7-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vekstein in view of Tsang et al. Claims 5, 7-11, and 13 depend from claim 1, respectively, and are allowable at least by virtue of their dependencies. Hence, the rejection of claims 5, 7-11, and 13 should be withdrawn.

**New Claims 14-20**

Newly added claims 14-20 emphasize various aspects. No new matter has been added. Vekstein fails to teach or suggest these claims. Entry and allowance of claims 14-20 is respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/596,025  
Amdt. Dated: September 3, 2008  
Reply to Office Action Dated: June 10, 2008

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims distinguish patentably and non-obviously over the prior art of record. An early indication of allowability is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Katharyn E. Owen Reg. No. 62,849  
Driggs, Hogg, Daugherty & Del Zoppo Co., L.P.A.  
38500 Chardon Road  
Willoughby Hills, Ohio 44094  
Phone: 1.440.391.5100  
Fax: 1.440.391.5101

Direct all correspondence to:  
Douglas B. McKnight, Reg. No. 50,447  
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards  
595 Miner Road  
Cleveland, Ohio 44143  
Phone: 1.440.483.2373  
Fax: 1.440.483.2452